

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成29年度
(第21号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2017

Volume XXI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2018・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2018

Interpretation of the notion of *gotra* by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa: Focusing on the phrase “*ṣaṇṇāṃ pāramitānāṃ dharmatālakṣaṇo viśeṣaḥ*”

Youngjin LEE

I. Introduction

Since the author of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (hereafter, AA)¹ proclaimed that [*gotra*], the basis of [bodhisattvas'] practice, has *dharmadhātu* as its own nature,² it has become one of the main topics dealt with by AA commentators in India as well as in Tibet.³ This theory has especially attracted attention from Buddhist philosophers regarding its close relation to the *tathāgatagarbha*. For example, Dharmamitra (fl. ca. 800) — who composed the *Prasphuṭa-padā*⁴, a sub-commentary on Haribhadra's short commentary (*Vivṛti*) — had first introduced the *tathāgatagarbha* notion into the discussion of the “*gotra* being in its natural state”⁵ (*prakṛtistham gotram*).⁶ Subsequently, Abhayākara Gupta (late eleventh to early twelfth century)⁷ linked it with the *tathāgatagarbha* and the single vehicle theory.⁸ All these commentators basically based their understanding of the *gotra* on the commentaty⁹ composed by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa (sixth century),¹⁰ and then developed their own ideas. Therefore, Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's *gotra* theory is basic and important for understanding the more mature and developed ideas of his successive commentators.

1. This versified commentary is traditionally ascribed to Maitreya-nātha, though this is doubtful from the perspective of modern scholarship. This is due to the fact that the first figure who ascribed authorship to Maitreya-nātha, namely the famous Haribhadra (ca. 770–810 CE), did so only in the eighth century (AA^w 1.13–18, 75.17–22 ; Vivṛti^A 1.07–14). Makransky (1997, 111) pointed out that ascribing authorship at such a late stage suggests that attribution may well have been used just as a means to lend greater authority to the text.

2. *ādharmaḥ pratipatteṣ ca dharmadhātusvabhāvakāḥ* || AA I. 5cd.

3. For this, see Mano (1967), Ruegg (1968), Ruegg (1977), Kano (2015, 59–64), Brunnhuölzl (2010, 283–292; 428–488), and Brunnhuölzl (2012, 123–136), etc.

4. *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ṣaṣṭhī-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstraṭīkā Prasphuṭapadā-nāma* D (No. 3796) *shes phyin, nya* 1b1–110a3.

5. Regarding this interpretation, see fn. 28.

6. Ruegg 1977, 285.

7. Ruegg (1977, 285), Hong (2010, XXVn4), and Li (2013, 1–3).

8. Ruegg 1977, 286–287.

9. This text commonly called *Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti*. However, this title did not come from the Sanskrit text, but from the Tibetan translation, “*phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa'i tshul gyi mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi man ngag gi bstan bcos kyi 'grel pa*.” In the Nepalese manuscript, the title is written as *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāyaprajñāpāramitopadeśaṃ Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstram*, which reminds us of AA itself. For the details, see Lee (2017a, 222–227).

10. Regarding Ārya's life story handed down to us, see Nakamura (2014, 19–27). My preference of “Vimuktiṣeṇa” to its proper Sanskrit form, “Vimuktisena” comes from readings of relatively old manuscripts in the 12th to 13th century that I consulted (Lee 2017a, 209n1). A supplementary title on the first folio recto of the newly identified manuscript of AA ascribe its author to Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa. Regarding this, see Lee (2017a, 213).

In modern scholarship, the research on Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's *gotra* theory appears to have been relatively active: Ruegg investigated thoroughly the notion of *gotra* explained by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa and his successor Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa and published it in 1968. Moreover, there has been a recent controversy between Matsumoto and Yamabe surrounding the *gotra* theory presented in AA I 39 and Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's comment on it.¹¹ These excellent works have made us capable of understanding Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's notion of the *gotra* more deeply.

My paper here seeks to revisit Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's notion of the *gotra*. The main reason why I venture to deal with this subject that has been already studied by the excellent scholars is that the proper attention has not been drawn to what I call Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's exclusive definition of the *gotra*, i.e., *ṣaṇṇāṃ pāramitānāṃ dharmatālakṣaṇo viśeṣaḥ*.¹² To my knowledge, the exact same wording appears in none of the AA commentaries.¹³ And what is even more striking is that Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa — who gives almost the same explanation on the *gotra* theory, as if he were identical to Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa¹⁴ — makes no mention of it. Here in this paper, I would like to show how we should understand this unique definition, and, if necessary, revise the reading referring to other relevant materials. In this process, I hope I can provide a more improved Sanskrit text of Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary using another manuscript preserved in Tibet, which the previous editor Pensa was not able to consult.¹⁵

In addition, I would like to give my own speculation on the contradictory statement proclaimed in AA I 39, that is, the *gotra* is undivided, but, at the same time, dividable.¹⁶ Referring to a passage in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* as well as the *maṅgala* verse of AA, I will try to show what motivation could possibly lie in maintaining such a contradictory statement.

¹¹ Matsumoto (1997, 171), Matsumoto and Yamabe (1997, 206–207; 217), Yamabe (1997, 201–203) and Yamabe (2017, 28–30).

¹² Ruegg (1968, 314) alone, without a detailed explanation, provided its translation, “particularity of the six perfections having as its characteristic the *dharmatā*.”

¹³ Only Abhayākaraḡupta makes mention of “*viśiṣṭaṃ gotraṃ*” in a relevant passage. See fn. 24.

¹⁴ Recently, Isoda (2014) raised the following question: Aren't the *Vṛtti*, i.e., Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, and the *Vārttika* are different translations of the same original text? According to Nakamura (2014, 43–44), AA on which Bhadanta commented should be seen as “another recension,” rather than an “incomplete version” as Haribhadra mentioned. Moreover, the 25.000 *Prajñāpāramitā* that Bhadanta consulted was unrevised recension, which is different from the recension that was revised in accordance with AA's system and used by Ārya. See Nakamura (2014, 37–39; 48). Regarding to the sections of *gotra* and the objective supports of the practice that we are dealing with, several quotations of Bhadanta are different from those of Ārya (fn. 57). Moreover, the *kārikās* on which both Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentaries are based are not same. With reference to AA I 40b and 41d, Ārya reads *te punaḥ kuśalādayaḥ* = *de yang dge la sogs pa yin* (That [all dharmas], furthermore, are [listed] beginning with wholesome *dharmas*) and *ye cāsādhāraṇā muneḥ* = *gang dag thub pa'i thun mong min* (those [dharmas] of the Muni which are unshared with others) respectively, Bhadanta has different readings, i.e., *'jig rten dge dang mi dge ba* (wholesome and unwholesome [dharmas] that are mundane) and *gang dag ston pa'i stobs la sogs* (those [dharmas] of the Teacher (**sāstr**) beginning with the [ten] powers) in order. The relationship between Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary and the *Vārttika*, as well as whether they are identical is to be studied thoroughly.

¹⁵ Based on one Sanskrit manuscript in the early twelfth century with its modern apograph, the whole Sanskrit text was edited by three scholars: 1st *Abhisamaya* by Pensa (1967), 2nd to 4th *Abhisamayas* by Cicuzza (2001), and 5th to 8th *Abhisamayas* by Nakamura (2014). In 2013, another manuscript of Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary was identified. This manuscript, which is now preserved in Tibet, probably dates back to the twelfth century. Recently, the new critical edition of the 1st *Abhisamaya* consulting both manuscripts has been published by Lee (2017b). For the information of both manuscripts, see Lee 2017b, 17–23.

¹⁶ Refer to the quotation [7] in this paper.

II. Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's definition of bodhisattvas' *gotra*

Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa, as does Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa, first starts with the meaning of *gotra* in the fifth section of the first *Abhisamaya* of his commentary.¹⁷ For both of them, the *gotra* indicates the basis (*ādhāra*) or foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*)¹⁸ of the bodhisattvas' practice that begins with generating the resolve [to become a buddha] (*cittotpāda*) and ends with the path of repeated cultivation (*bhāvanāmārga*). Following AA's two *kārikās* (AA I 37-38), they say that the *gotra* is divided into thirteen types in accordance with the distinction of different states of *dharma*s of the practice.¹⁹

Then Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa, while elucidating one passage quoted from PvsP, defines the bodhisattvas' *gotra* as such:

[1] For showing that the [bodhisattva] is the support of each of these *dharma*s of realization, [the Blessed one] says [in the 25,000 *Prajñāpāramitā*], “Subhūti! The object referred to by the word “bodhisattva” is nothing real. And why? Subhūti! This is because neither production of [bodhisattvas'] enlightenment nor its existence is existent or perceived.” By this [statement] he reveals that the *gotra* — ① superiority [to *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*] with regard to the six perfections [which must be developed and practiced by them on the path to becoming a buddha, and it is] characterized by (or defined as) the true nature of *dharma*s — is the cause of application of the word “bodhisattva,” but it is not the object referred to by the word, which functions as a real thing since it is reasonable that the enlightenment, the supported [by the supporter = bodhisattva] is not substantially existent.²⁰

The point here seems to be that bodhisattvas, bases (*gotra*) of *dharma*s of realization, are not really existent (in other words, empty or absence of its own nature) because their enlightenment, which is to be realized by bodhisattvas, does not exist substantially. Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa, nevertheless, defines the bodhisattvas' *gotra* as “superiority with regard to six-perfections, which is characterized by the true nature of *dharma*s” (*ṣaṇṇām pāramitānām dharmatā-lakṣaṇo viśeṣo gotram*). This notion has not been handed down to not only his immediate successor Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa but also other Indian commentators as far as I know.²¹

This interpretation would make sense in itself. However, considering the following definition of the *gotra* by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa as well as by Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa, we need to have second thoughts about this understanding.

[2] It has been said in the fourteenth generation of the resolve [to become a buddha] that [a

¹⁷ My division of sections is based on section colophons of two manuscripts. The colophon at the end of the fifth reads as follows: “Bases, objective supports, and [distant and future] goals of [Bodhisattvas'] practice has been taught.” (*uktāḥ pratipatter ādhārāmbanoddeśāḥ ||*). For the division of sections of the 1st *Abhisamaya* and its section colophons, see Lee (2017b, 27-29).

¹⁸ In Vārttika_{Tib}, the equivalent of *pratiṣṭhā* is “*zhabs su 'jug pa*” (**caraṇapratīṣṭhā*?)

¹⁹ A 24v2-3, B 22r6-23r1, E^p 73.02-08 ; Vārttika_{Tib} D (No. 3788) *shes phyin, kha* 34a1-34a3, Q (No. 5186) *sher phyin, kha* 40a7-40b2.

²⁰ *yas tasya tasyādhigamadharmasyādhāra ity āha | “apadārthaḥ subhūte bodhisattvapadārthaḥ | tat kasya hetoḥ | na hi subhūte bodher¹ utpādo vāstīti vā vidyate vopalabhyate ve”ti | anenādheyāyā bodher² adravya-tvopapattiyā ① ṣaṇṇām pāramitānām dharmatālakṣaṇo viśeṣo gotram bodhisattvaśabdapravṛttinimittam, na tu vastubhūtaḥ padārtha ity āvedayati | (¹ bodher] B E^p, bodhir A ; ² anenādheyāyā bodher] A B, anenādheyā bodhir E^p) A 23v3-4, B 23r1-23r2, E^p 73.08-14 ; cf. E^L [88].10-15 (The underline is mine.); Regarding another English translations, see Sparham (2006, 79).*

²¹ For corresponding passages without this definition, see the following sources: Bhadanta's Vārttika_{Tib} D 34a2-3, Q 40b2-4; Haribhadra's AA^W 76.04-12. For Abhayākara's *Munimatālaṃkāra*, refer to fn. 24.

bodhisattva] who wants to realize suchness of all *dharmas* (*sarvadharmatathātā*) [should train in the perfection of wisdom]. In this [quotation], suchness of all *dharmas* indicates the shared true nature of *dharmas* (*sāmānyadharmatā*) that are comprehensively listed by things to avoid, their remedies, and so on. [It has been also taught] that [a bodhisattva] who wants to realize suchness of *dharmadhātu* (*dharmadhātutathātā*) [should train in the perfection of wisdom.] [In this passage, ② the compound *dharmadhātutathātā*] means the true nature connected with *viśeṣa* by which the *dharmadhātu* is to be called [bodhisattvas'] *gotra*²² [in ① the fifth section of the first *Abhisamaya*].²³

While analyzing the compound “*dharmadhātutathātā*,” Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa and Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa identify *dharmadhātu* with *viśeṣa* and elucidate that this *viśeṣa* makes *gotra* of *dharmadhātu*. Given that Abhayākara Gupta adopts “*viśiṣṭam gotram*” instead of “*viśeṣo gotram*” in a passage relevant to ①,²⁴ the function of the *viśeṣa* is considered to limit the range of meanings of the *dharmadhātu*, which, in turn, leads us to interpret the *viśeṣa* (①) as particular or specific *dharmadhātu*, that is, *viśiṣṭadharmadhātu*.

If my understanding of the *viśeṣa* as *viśiṣṭadharmadhātu* is accepted, a loose connection between the six perfections and the particular *dharmadhātu* can hardly be explained. It is more so considering that the *dharmadhātu*, as we will see, functions as objective support (*ālambana*) of bodhisattvas' practice or as the object-condition (*ālambanapratyaya*) of supramundane *dharmas* of the noble ones.

rNgog Blo Idan shes rab, Tibetan translator of Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, rendered the phrase ① differently: “[Bodhisattvas'] *gotra* characterized by the true nature of *dharmas* belongs to the six sense-spheres” (*skye mched drug gi chos nyid kyi mtshan nyid kyi rigs*).²⁵ On the basis of this, we would be able to revise “*ṣaṇṇām pāramitānām*” to “*ṣaṇṇām āyatanānām*.” Further, this revision could be supported by Ratnākaraśānti's gloss on “the object referred to by the word bodhisattva” (**bodhisattvasya padārthaḥ/ bodhisattva-padasyārthaḥ*)²⁶ in the *Śuddhimatī*, in which he understands it as “particularity of six sense-spheres.”²⁷ However, I believe, we need more decisive evidence to confirm this emendation.

22. Vṛtti_{Tib} is different in that the *dharmadhātu* is omitted : “*khyad par gang gis rigs zhes 'chad par 'gyur ba de'i chos nyid gang yin pa'o ll*” ([The compound *dharmadhātutathātā*] means the true nature connected with particularity by which [bodhisattvas'] *gotra* is to be explained). This interpretation, however, is not supported by the Vārttika_{Tib}, which has “*chos kyi dbyings*”, an interpretation of *dharmadhātu* : “*khyad par gang gis chos kyi dbyings la rigs zhes bya bar 'chad par 'gyur ba de'i chos nyid gang yin pa'o ll*”

23. *yad uktaṃ caturdaśe cittotpāde “sarvadharmatathātām anuboddhukāmeṇa” ti | tatra sarvadharmatathātāyā vipakṣapratipakṣādisaṃgrhītānām dharmānām sāmānyadharmatā | ② “dharmadhātutathātām anuboddhukāmeṇa” ti yena viśeṣena dharmadhātur gotram ity ākhyāsyate tasya yā dharmatā | A 7v1–2, B 7r1–2, E^p 27.21–28.05; cf. E^L [22].5–8; Vṛtti_{Tib} D No. (3787) *shes phyin, ka* 25b1, Q (No. 5185) *sher phyin, ka* 28b5–6.*

24. This passage in the *Munimatālaṃkāra* seems to echo Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's definition of *gotra* in [1]. Thanks to Kano (2015, 60n42), we can refer to its Sanskrit version: “However, when the completely pure *dharmadhātu* comes forth through removing stains of conceptualization without remaining, [bodhisattvas'] enlightenment is attained. For this very reason, the particular *gotra*, i.e., the cause of application of the word “bodhisattva”, becomes the base of the armor practice, etc., since aspiration toward twenty-two kinds of generation of the resolve [to become a buddha] and their superior qualities.” (*akṣilavikalpamalāpanayanāt tu suviśuddho dharmadhātur āvirbhavan bodhiḥ sampadyate | ata eva viśiṣṭam gotram bodhisattvaśabdapravṛttinimittam dvāviṃśaticittotpādānām tadviśeṣānām ca cchandāt prabhṛti sannāhādipratipattinām cādharāḥ | Munimatālaṃkāra* Sanskrit Manuscript. 85v2-3)

25. Note that here the Tibetan equivalent to *viśeṣa* is absent.

26. The second alternative was proposed by Prof. Saito Akira. I am deeply grateful to him for this suggestion.

27. “*byang chub sems dpa'i tshig gi don zhes bya ba ni skye mched drug gi khyad par ro ll*” *Śuddhimatī*_{Tib} D (No. 3801) *shes phyin, ta* 102a7.

After having correlates the thirteen types of bodhisattvas' *gotra* listed in AA I 37-38 with relevant passages of PvsP, both Vimuktiṣeṇa provide another definition of the *gotra*:

[3] [The blessed one], anticipating the question that what is then the definition of the base of [bodhisattvas'] practice says [in the 25,000 *Prajñāpāramitā*]: “Subhūti! A bodhisattva should therefore train himself in non-attachment to all *dharma*s [and] in their unreality, on the basis of non-imagination and non-conceptualization.” In this [passage], the imagination and the conceptualization indicate adherence to things and their objective characteristics respectively. It is to be known that the non-attached comes from the absence of these two. The unreality denotes suchness of all *dharma*s. ③ Hence, by this [statement] he shows that the support of the practice is *gotra* being in its natural state (*prakṛtistham gotram*)²⁸ because *dharmadhātu* alone is the cause of the *dharma*s of the noble ones.²⁹

In this passage, Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa seems to accept the “*prakṛtiṣṭhagotra*”³⁰ —with the different meaning— of the two kinds of bodhisattvas' *gotra* that are presented in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.³¹ The reason for this is that *dharmadhātu* or *specific dharmadhātu* alone is the cause of the *dharma*s of the noble ones. Moreover, Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa indirectly and Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa directly reject the second definition of *gotra*, i.e., attained *gotra* (*samudānītagotra*) through the practice of merits in the past lives.³²

[4] Others hold that *gotra* is the distinct state of the six sense-spheres, which is twofold: one attained by conditions³³ and one abiding in “*prakṛti*” (*prakṛtyavasthita*)³⁴. They should explain

28. I followed Schmithausen's second definition of the *prakṛtistha*, “being in its natural, unrefined state,” which is supported by Vṛtti_{Tib}, “*rang bzhin du / la gnas pa*.” Vārttika_{Tib}, however, reads “*rang bzhin gyis gnas pa*,” which can be interpreted either as “innate, inherent” (see Schmithausen 2014, 119n490) or as “existing by nature” (Yamabe 1997, 202). My choice of the former over the latter can be attested in the explanation, rather assumption of Ārya and Bhadanta, which shows that the *prakṛti* in the *prakṛtistha* is synonymous with the *dharmatā*. This assumption clearly suggests that both of them use the *prakṛti* as a noun, not as adverb.

29. *kiṃlakṣaṇas¹ tarhi pratipattyādhāra ity āha* | “*sarvadharmāṇāṃ hi subhūte bodhisattvenāsaktatāyām asadbhūtātāyām śikṣitavyam akalpanatām anavakalpanatām copādāye*”*ti* | *tatra kalpanāvakalpane vastutan-nimittābhiniवेशau, tadabhāvād asakto veditavyaḥ² | asadbhūtātā sarvadharmatathatā* | ③ *tad anena dharmadhātur evāryadharmahetuvāt³ prakṛtistham gotram pratipattyādhāra ity upadarśayati* || (¹ *kiṃlakṣaṇas*] A B, *kiṃ lakṣaṇam* E^p ; ² *asakto veditavyaḥ*] A B(*aśakto*), *asaktir veditavyā* E^p ; ³ *evāryadharmahetuvāt*] B(*°rmmā°*), *evārya(dh)arm.a .e ++ i** A, *evāryadharmāṇāṃ hetuvāt* E^p) ; A 25v6–26r1, B 24r3, E^p 76.12–18; cf. E^L [92].13–18. For other English translation, see Ruegg (1968, 309) and Sparham (2006, 83); Vārttika_{Tib} D 36a1–2, Q 42b7–43a1.

30. Ārya and Bhadanta further explain that the “*pratisthagotra*” intended here is without hindrance (*nirantarāya*) [to attaining enlightenment (*bodhi*) or *nirvāṇa*]. Here, hindrance (*antarāya*) denotes four defects (*ādīnava*) composed of defilements, bad friends, destituteness (*vighāta*, *phongs pa*), and dependence, those which are defined as defects of *gotra* in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* 3.7.

31. Regarding two kinds of *gotra* in the early *Yogācāra* texts, consult Yamabe (1997, 195–196).

32. Bhadanta adds one sentence to the end of the passage, which clearly reveals that he and his predecessor Ārya have rejected the second definition in this context: “By the [expression], ‘because of unreality (*dnogs po med pa nyid*, **asadbhūtātā*) of [all *dharma*s],’ it is clearly explained that the *gotra* is the support of the practice because *dharmadhātu* alone is the cause of the *dharma*s of the Noble Ones. This *gotra* is one which exists by nature (*rang bzhin gyis gnas pa* **prakṛtistha*), but not one which results from conditions (*rkyen las byung ba*, **pratyayotpanna*).” Also see Ruegg (1968, 312–313).

33. The Vārttika_{Tib} adopts “*rkyen tshogs pa las byung ba*” (**pratyayasāmagryutpanna*), interpreted as “[the *gotra*] arisen from an assemblage of conditions,” instead of “*rkyen gyis yang dag par blangs pa* (**pratyayasamudānta*)” in the Vṛtti_{Tib}.

34. In the context of the classical *Yogācāra* theory of *gotra*, this should be understood as “existing by nature” (=innate, *rang bzhin gyis gnas pa*), which Yamabe (Matsumoto and Yamabe 1997, 216–217), opposing to

the meaning of the word “*prakṛti*” in [the compound of] the “*prakṛtisthagotra*.” If it is synonymous with [generative] cause³⁵, it also applies to the “[*gotra*] attained by conditions;” what then is the difference in meaning [between these two classes of *gotras*]? ④ However, when [we take the word “*prakṛti*”] as a synonym of *dharmatā* [, by which we understand “*prakṛtisthagotra*” as the *gotra* staying in / existing as *dharmatā*,] there is no such problem.³⁶

Noteworthy in this passage is that the *prakṛti* of the *prakṛtisthagotra* is a synonym of or interchangeable with *dharmatā* but not with the generative or productive cause (*kāraṇa*). This explanation reminds us of the word *dharmatālakṣaṇa* that modifies *viśeṣa* in ①. Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa, as well as Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa, seems to assert that, even in the context of the early Yogācāra texts, we should understand the compound “*prakṛtisthagotra*” as the *gotra* existing as *dharmatā*, in consequence of which we can infer that *dharmatālakṣaṇa* has the same meaning as “*prakṛtistha*.”

Gathering all information we have about the *gotra* up to now, we can reorganize the phrase ①, in which Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa’s exclusive definition of the *gotra* appears.

①-1. Bodhisattvas’ *gotra* indicates particular *dharmadhātu* either of the six perfections or of the six sense-spheres, which is being in its natural [and unaltered]³⁷ state and is characterized by the true nature of *dharmas*, in other words, one that exists as the true nature of *dharmas*.

The remaining problem now is which of these two, i.e., either the six perfections or the six sense-spheres, the particular *dharmadhātu* connects with. Before proceeding to this subject, I would like to take a look at the function of the *dharmadhātu* in the bodhisattvas’ practice to understand the *gotra* more clearly.

III. *Dharmadhātu* functioning as an objective support.

Yamabe (1997, 202) has already pointed out that in AA and Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa’s commentary on it, *dharmadhātu* as the basis for supramundane attainment aids the arising of supramundane wisdom by serving as its cognitive object (*ālambana*) as in the *Viniścaya-saṃgrahaṇī*.³⁸ Moreover, Vasubandhu, in commenting on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.15c, “*hetutvāc cāryadharmāṇām*” parallel to ③ “*dharmadhātu* alone is the cause of the *dharmas* of the noble ones,” makes clear that *dharmadhātu*, one of the synonyms of emptiness

Matsumoto’s interpretation of “the *gotra* located on *prakṛti*” or “the *gotra* existing on *prakṛti*,” discussed this point in detail. However, here we should consider how Ārya as well as Bhadanta accepted this notion. It is probable that they understood this term in accordance with their system, not with the classical Yogācāra theory as its context shows. cf. Yamabe 2017, 25–32.

³⁵. Regarding this interpretation, I consulted Ruegg (1968, 310; 313).

³⁶. “*ṣaḍāyatanaviśeṣo gotraṃ, tac ca dvividhaṃ pratyayasamudānītaṃ prakṛtyavasthitaṃ ce*”ty apare / *taiḥ prakṛtisthagotre prakṛtyabhidhānasyārtho vācyaḥ*¹ / *kāraṇaparyāyaś cet tad api pratyayasamudānītaṃ iti ko ’rthaviśeṣaḥ*² / ④ *dharmatāparyāye punar esa doṣo nāsti* / (¹ vācyaḥ] A B, vācyaḥ E^p; ko ’rthaviśeṣaḥ] A B (° *rtha*°), *kim arthaviśeṣaḥ* E^p) A 26r2, B 24r4-5, E^p 76.24-77.03; cf. E^L [93].6-9 ; Vṛtti_{Tib} D 36a4-5, Q 43a3-5 ; Vārttika_{Tib} D 36a4-5, Q 43a3-5. It is slightly modified translation of Yamabe (1997, 202; 451n50). For other English translations, see Ruegg (1968, 309-310) and Sparham (2006, 84).

³⁷. For this insertion, refer to quotation [5].

³⁸. With reference to *dharmadhātu* (= *tathatā*) functioning as object-condition (*ālambanapratyaya*) of supramundane *dharmas*, see Yamabe (1990) and Schmithausen (2014, 569–570; 572; 577–578; 582; 594).

(*śūnyatā*)³⁹ serves as the cognitive object or objective support of *dharmas* of the noble ones.⁴⁰

In both Vimuktiṣeṇas' commentaries, there is a passage that *dharmadhātu* is one of many objective supports of bodhisattvas' practice from generating the resolve to become a buddha to the path of repeated cultivation.

[5] [In AA I 40a, it is proclaimed that objective support of the practice consists of all *dharmas* (*ālambanam sarvadharmāḥ*)]. Those who think that *dharmadhātu* alone is the objective support [of the practice] should give an answer to how purity of the objective support becomes more and more enhanced.⁴¹ If you assert [as in the *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.16cd] that purity [of emptiness] is accepted like the purity of water-element, gold, and *ākāśa* [from the viewpoint of the removal of adventitious stains, but its nature does not change at all], in this case the undesired consequence of partial purity would follow. This is because you have not abandoned the conceptualization of things to avoid and their remedies ... Having considered so, it is reasonable to say that characteristics of the base (*ādhāra=gotra*) and the objective support (*ālambana*) are different and that purity of the objective support can be attained. [The former is] due to the fact that *gotra* has [unalterable] *prakṛti* as its chief while the objective support has *vikṛti* (=alteration) as its chief. However, [the latter is possible] because both of them are not mutually exclusive. For this very reason, [the Blessed one] says [in the 25,000 *Prajñāpāramitā*], ⑤ “A bodhisattva should therefore train himself in non-attachment to all *dharmas* and in their unreality.” What does it mean? The objective support is the alternation (*vikṛti*) intertwined with the [unalterable] *prakṛti*, not a mere alternation.⁴²

In this passage, both Vimuktiṣeṇas first reject the opponent's idea that *dharmadhātu* is the only objective support of bodhisattvas' practice and its purity comes from the removal of adventitious stains, not from the alteration of its nature. Then, they clearly mention that the *gotra*, i.e., *dharmadhātu* differs from the objective support (*ālambana*) in that their attributes are distinguishable, that is, the former is unaltered but the latter can be altered. However, these two things are not totally separated since *dharmadhātu* has already been intertwined with *ālambanas*, i.e., all *dharmas*. They also elucidate that during the practice, possibly meditative practice, bodhisattvas have as their cognitive object not only the *dharmadhātu* but also all *dharmas* of which the attribute is alternation. For giving authority to their explanation, they cite the same passage as in [3], in which two Vimuktiṣeṇas accept the

³⁹. In MAVBh I.14, in addition to *dharmadhātu*, four terms (*tathatā*, *bhūtakotiḥ*, *ānimittam*, and *paramārthatā*) are listed as synonyms of emptiness.

⁴⁰. MAVBh^N 222.23–24.02. The following translation is quoted from Schmithausen (2014, 571): “[Emptiness is called] *dharmadhātu* because it is the cause of the dharmas of the Noble Ones, (i.e., the supramundane *dharmas*), for the *dharmas* of the Noble Ones originate from it [insofar] as [it is their] objective support (*ālambana*). In this [expression], “*dhātu*” means indeed “cause.”

⁴¹. According to the Vārttika_{Tib}, this can be interpreted differently: “... how non-perception (*dmigs su med pa*, **anupalambha*) reaches the distinct state of purification progressively ...” (yang 'ga' zhig gis chos kyi dbyings nyid dmigs pa yin no snyam du sems na | *dmigs su med pa des gong nas gong du rnam par dag pa'i khyad par du 'gro ba ci lta bu yin zhe na | brjod par bya ste |*)

⁴². ye tu dharmadhātum evāḥānam manyante tair ālambanasyottarottaraśuddhiviśeṣagamanam katham iti vaktavyam | “*abdhātukanakākāśaśuddhivac chuddhir iṣyata*” iti ced evaṃ tarhi vipakṣapratipakṣavikalpa-prahāṇābhāvāt prādeśikaśuddhiprasaṅgaḥ | ... evaṃ ca kṛtvā prakṛtipradhānam gotram vikṛtipradhānam ālambanam ubhayaṃ tūbhayatrāpratiśiddham ity ādhārālambanayor¹ lakṣaṇabheda ālambanaśuddhigamanam copapannam bhavati | ata evāha ⑤ “*sarvadharmānām hi subhūte bodhisattvenāsaktatāyām asadbhūtātāyām² śikṣitavyam*” iti | ko 'rthah | *prakṛtyanuviddhā vikṛtir³ ālambanam na vikāramātram iti |* (‘*ādhārālambanayor*] A B, *ādhārāṇālambanayor* E^P ; ² *asadbhūtātāyām*] B, *asadbhūtātāyām* A E^P ; ³ *anuviddhā vikṛtir*] A B, *anusahitavikṛtir* E^P); A 27r1–4, B 35r4–6, E^P 19.19–80.06; cf. E^L [97].10–[98].08 ; Vṛtti_{Tib} D 61b1–7, Q 70a6 70b5; Vārttika_{Tib} D 37b2–38a1, Q 44b6–45a6.

concept of *prakṛtisthagotra* alone. This implies the *gotra* being in its natural and unaltered state (*prakṛtisthagotra*), in other words, specific *dharmadhātu* (②) serves as objective support of bodhisattvas' practice.

As Schmithausen (2014, 578) mentioned, that which has suchness (*dharmatā* = *dharmadhātu* = [*viśiṣṭa*]*dharmadhātu*) as its object-condition must be some form of the mind or a mental factor, more precisely, some form of insight (*jñāna*). If then, the *dharmadhātu* as the object-condition of bodhisattvas' insight should belong to the sphere of mental objects (*dharmāyatana*). According to the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, "*prakṛtisthagotra*" identical to the "*prakṛtisthagotra*" consists of the eighteen *dhātus*,⁴³ which include *dharmadhātu* that is also called the sphere of mental objects (*dharmāyatana*) among the six external sense-spheres. In the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) —which is interchangeable with *gotra* and *dharmadhātu* in commentaries of Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa and Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa in that from which the [*dharmas* of] noble ones originate⁴⁴— belongs to the *dharmadhātu* and is a part of it.⁴⁵ Therefore, it is probable that the *viśeṣa* (①), which is *viśiṣṭadharmadhātu* (③), connotes a certain specific *dharmadhātu* (= *dharmāyatana*), i.e., *śūnyatā*⁴⁶, among various mental objects. Applying this idea, we can reinterpret ① as follows:

①-2. Bodhisattvas' *gotra* indicates particularity (= a specific *dharmadhātu*) among the six [external] sense-spheres, which [exists in a natural and unaltered state and] is characterized by the true nature of *dharmas*.

The following gloss on the compound "*śaḍāyatanaviśeṣa*," which was made by an anonymous commentator and handed down to Tsong kha pa, can support my reinterpretation.⁴⁷

According to others, the sixth external base, particularity (*khyad par*, **viśeṣa*) or a part (*nang tshan*, **ekadeśa*?) of the sphere of mental objects (**dharmāyatana*) is suchness (**tathatā*),

⁴³. Yamabe 1997, 196. Cf. AKBh^E 21.05-10. Regarding its translation, see Matsumoto and Yamabe (1997, 212).

⁴⁴. "However, according to the semantic elucidation of words based on phonetic similarities, *gotra* [that is analyzed into *guṇa* + *uttarana* (from *ut-√ir*) as does in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*] indicates the origin of qualities. This is because the meaning is that from this [*gotra*] various qualities spring up, i.e., arise. Accepting such [elucidation, the Blessed one, in the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*,] says that all noble ones originate from the unconditioned." *niruktaṃ tu guṇottaraṇārthena' gotraṃ, tasmād dhi te te² guṇā rohanti prabhavanti arthaḥ | evaṃ ca kṛtvocyate "asaṃskṛtaprabhāvīṭāḥ sarvāryapudgalā" iti | (¹ guṇottaraṇārthena) A B, guṇottaraṇārthena E^P; ² te te] A B, te E^P) A 26r6, B 24v2, E^P 77.29-21; cf. E^L [94].09-11; Vārtika_{Tib} D 36b4-5, Q 45b5-6.*

⁴⁵. *dravyavān ekah | asaṃskṛtaṃ hi sāravād dravyam || tac ca dharmadhātāv asty ato dharmadhātur eko dravyayuktaḥ ||* AKBh^E 41.05-07; *eṣāṃ aṣṭādaśānāṃ dhātūnāṃ madhye kati nityāḥ katy anityāḥ | na kaśicat sakalo 'sti nityo dhātur api tu nityā dharmā asaṃskṛtāḥ | tena dharmadhātvekaśo nityaḥ śeṣa anityaḥ ||* AKBh^E 57.21-24.

⁴⁶. Ārya considers *dharmānairātmya* (selflessness of *dharmas*) as a synonym of *dharmadhātu*: *dharmadhātuparame loka iti lakṣaṇālambanato dharmānairātmyapradhāne loka |* A 30v3, B28v1, E^P 89.6-7; cf. EL [110].5-6. Abhayākara Gupta, who is considered to have followed Ārya's commentary faithfully, define *dharmadhātu* as "absence of own nature of all *dharmas*" (**sarvadharmāṇiṣvabhāvatā*) : *rīgs 'di ni ci l dmīgs pa ni ci l ched du bya ba ni ci zhe na l brjod par bya ste chos kyi dbyings chos thams cad rang bzhin med pa nyid kyi mtshan nyid can kho na :* Munimatālaṃkāra_{Tib} D (No. 3903) *dbu ma*, a 169b6.

⁴⁷. Thanks to Kim (2012, 53), I could turn my eyes to this passage. Kim pointed out that the closest elucidation to this opinion is Ārya's. He, however, hesitated to attribute this opinion to Ārya because the author of AA and Ārya had not accepted the idea of "*śaḍāyatanaviśeṣa*."

because it is taught that [*śaḍāyatanaviśeṣa*] is acquired by *dharmatā* (**dharmatāpratilabdha*).⁴⁸

In my opinion, Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's exclusive notion of bodhisattvas' *gotra* in [1] is a reinterpretation of the *gotra* theory represented in the early Yogācāra texts. Having borrowed the compound, the "*śaḍāyatanaviśeṣa*," from them, he analyzes it into "*śaṇṇām āyatanānām viśeṣaḥ*" and assigned a new meaning, i.e., "external sense-spheres" to it. The intention here is to assert that the *gotra* of bodhisattvas and others cannot be decided or differentiated by their internal capacities (*āyatanaviśeṣa*=*indriyaviśeṣa*)⁴⁹. The word *dharmatālakṣaṇa*, which means [the *gotra*] characterized by *dharmatā*, appears to be a modified form of the *dharmatāpratilabdha* (naturally acquired). These modifications — as well as alone accepting "*prakṛtisthagotra*" of the two kinds of *gotra* with a different interpretation, that is, *gotra* being in its natural and unaltered state or existing as the true nature of *dharma*s — are regarded to be a prerequisite for introducing the new definition of the *gotra*, i.e., *dharmadhātu* that has been proclaimed in AA. Based on this assumption as well as the materials that we have seen, I suggest we should emend "*śaṇṇām pāramitānām*" (①) to "*śaṇṇām āyatanānām*."

As for the reason why Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's successive commentators made no mention of "a particularity of the six [external] sense-spheres," I only assume that for them, the meaning of *dharmadhātu* has been already fixed as *śūnyatā* and *dharmatā*, etc., so they did not need to limit its meaning in this context. Alternately, they would have wanted to remove the influence from the early Yogācāra texts.

IV. Inclusivism presented in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and its commentaries.

One of the most famous *kārikās* of AA is probably the thirty-ninth verse of the first *Abhisamaya*.⁵⁰ There, the author of AA proclaims that, in principle, the division of *gotra* is impossible but nonetheless they differentiate the *gotra* on the basis of differences of *dharma*s that are supported by the supporter, *dharmadhātu*. This verse is important in that AA accepts, at least partially, the three vehicle theory. This statement also seems tricky and contradictory in itself since it asserts that the *gotra* is undivided, but, at the same time, dividable. In this section, as a kind of conclusion, I would like to give my own answer to why the author made such a contradictory statement.

After rejecting the *gotra* that is attained by conditions (*pratyayasamudānītam gotram*) and redefining the "*prakṛtistham gotram*" as the one existing as the true nature of *dharma*s ([4]), Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa and Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa hypothesize their opponent's objection and then provide a response to it.

[6] [Objection:] If the *dharmadhātu* is the *gotra* [of bodhisattvas], then it would result in [the undesired consequence] that all [sentient beings would] attain the state of being established in

⁴⁸. Gser phreng 334,19-20: *kha cig ni phyi'i skye mched drug pa chos kyi skye mched kyi khyad par ram nang tshan de bzhi nyid yin tel chos nyid kyi thob pa zhes pas so zhes zher ro* ||; For this translation, I consulted Ruegg (1969, 103) and Kim (2012, 51).

⁴⁹. Ruegg 1968, 310n25.

⁵⁰. *dharmadhātor asambhedād gotrabhedo na yujyate | ādheyadharmabhedāt tu tadbhedāḥ parigīyate || AA I.39.*

the noble lineage (*gotrastha*)⁵¹ without exception, since the [*dharmadhātu*] exists equally⁵² [in all sentient beings].

[Answer:] ⑥ It is called *gotra* in the way that when [*dharmadhātu*]⁵³ is being cognized objectively it becomes the cause of the *dharma*s of the noble ones.⁵⁴ Therefore, how can one find overextension in this case (= in our use of the term *gotra*).⁵⁵

In this passage, both Vimuktiṣeṇas clearly mention that the use of the term “*gotra*” has a certain limitation; when *dharmadhātu* functions as the objective support of bodhisattvas’ practice and aids the arising of supramundane wisdom by serving as its object-condition (*ālambanapratyaya*), in this case only the word *gotra* can have the meaning of *gotra* as *dharmadhātu*. So the opponent’s objection that according to your assertion all beings would attain the state of being established in the noble lineage, in other words, all beings would become bodhisattvas who are predestinated to be buddhas, has been refuted.

After this passage, which does not seem to be directly related to the three vehicle theory,⁵⁶ another objection with reference to the three vehicle theory.

[7] [Objection:] Even so, **since *dharmadhātu* cannot be differentiated, any distinction among *gotra* is not reasonable** [AA I 39ab], saying that this is the *gotra* of *śrāvakas*, this is the *gotra* of *pratyekabuddhas*, and this is the *gotra* of Buddhas ...

[Answer:] This is true. However, **nonetheless, distinction among the [*gotra*] is proclaimed in accordance with distinction among *dharma*s that is supported** [AA I 39cd], as in the example that pots made from a single lump of clay and baked in the same fire can be named differently, according to what is put in them, as “honey pot,” “sugar pot,” and so forth.⁵⁷

⁵¹. The term “*gautrastha*” instead of ‘*gotrastha*’ is appeared in both manuscripts A and B. This term, which has not found in Sanskrit texts available to me, might be a scribal error for “*gotrastha*.” The *gotrastha* is, according to Takasaki Jikidō’s paper published in 1973 that is not available to me, almost never appears in Mahāyāna sūtras and is typical of the *Yogācāra* literature (Yamabe 1997, 451–452n51) ; According to BoBh^W 211.11–14, The *gotrastha* bodhisattva is explained as the one who is predestined to attain the supreme and perfect enlightenment when he or she meets with favorable conditions; Nanayakkara defines this term which is a synonym of *gotravihāra* as follows: “A *gotrastha*, i.e., one who is established in the noble lineage, is endowed with noble qualities and high aims which are characteristic features of a bodhisattva” in the Encyclopedia of Buddhism (Nanayakkara 1992, “*Gotra-vihāra*”).

⁵². According to Vārtika_{Tib}, it is “pervades universally” (*spyir khyab pa nyid yin pa’i phyir*, **sāmānya-vyāptitvāt*).

⁵³. Regarding this insertion, I followed the Sāratamā¹ 165.24–25; “*dharmadhātuś cālambyamāna ārya-dharmāṇaṃ hetutvāt*.”

⁵⁴. Regarding other commentators’ interpretations of this sentence, see the following materials: AA^W 77.21–22, Vivṛti^A 22.12–13 (by Haribhadra); *Prasphuṭapadā* D (No.3796) *shes phyin, nya* 48b7–49a3 (by Dharmamitra) and its translation (Ruegg 1977, 294) ; *Munimatālaṃkāra*_{Tib} D 170b3–4 (by Abhayākara Gupta) and its translation (Ruegg 1977, 301).

⁵⁵. *nanu ca dharmadhātōr gotratve¹ sarvo gotrasthaḥ² prāpnoti tasya sāmānyavartitvāt* | ⑥ *yathā cālambyamāna āryadharmāṇaṃ hetur bhavati tathā gotram ucyata iti kim atrātiprasaṅgaṃ mṛgayate* | (¹ gotratve] A B(ggō°), gotratvaṃ E^P; ² sarvo gotrasthaḥ] E^P, sarve gautrasthaḥ A B) (For this emendation following E^P, see Lee 2017b, 33–34): A 26r3, B 24r5–6, E^P 77.04–07; cf. E^L [93].11–13; Vārtika_{Tib} D 36a5–6, Q 43a6–7.

⁵⁶. Haribhadra relates ⑥ to the division of three vehicles directly in AA^A and Vivṛti. In Vivṛti especially, he explains that ⑥ is the genuine solution of the opponent’s objection, while AA I 39cd along with the simile of pots and their contents is just a conventional way of speaking (*laukikokti*) which makes less intelligent understand more easily. See Vivṛti^A 22.07–19.

⁵⁷. *evam api dharmadhātōr asambhedād gotrabhedo¹ na yujyate* | *idaṃ śrāvakagotram idaṃ pratyekabuddhagotram idaṃ buddhagotram iti* | ... *satyam evaṃ etat* | *tathāpi ādheyadharmabhedāt tu tadbhedaḥ parigīyate* || *ekamṛddravayābhīnirvṛttaikatejaḥparipakvaḥśaudraśarkarādibhājanabhedodāharaṇena* | (¹ gotrabhedo] A E^P, gotravibhedo B): A 26r3–4, B 24r6–24v1, E^P 77.08–15; cf. E^L [93].14–[94].06; Vārtika_{Tib} D 36a6–36b2, Q 43a7–43b4. Bhadanta, saying “*ji skad du mdo de las*,” appears to have quoted the example from

Commenting on AA, Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa and Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa mention that, in principle, *gotra* cannot be divided into three vehicles; nonetheless, it can be divided because *dharmas* that are supported by the supporter (= *dharmadhātu*) are different. In other words, even though *śrāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas*, and bodhisattvas have *dharmadhātu* as the objective support equally in the spiritual practice, their *dharmas* of realization are distinguished, that is, the selflessness of person (*pudgalanairātmya*) for *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*, but the selflessness of phenomena [as well as of person] ([*pudgala*]*dharmanairātmya*) for bodhisattvas.

However, the discrepancy between undivided *dharmadhātu* and multiple vehicle theory does not seem to be able to be fully resolved in this explanation. Then, there still remains a question: “Why did they strive to retain the traditional three vehicle theory even though for them it basically contradicts the most important concept of the *gotra*, i.e., *dharmadhātu*?” I assume this has something to do with the inclusivism shown in the *Prajñāpāramitā*s. In the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, there is a passage that through the *Prajñāpāramitā* alone, one can attain not only the stages of bodhisattvas and Buddhas but also those of *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*.

[8] Whether a bodhisattva wants to train himself at the stage of *śrāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas*, bodhisattvas, or Buddhas, he should learn this perfection of wisdom. He should receive, memorize, recite, master, and thoroughly investigate it. And why? Because here in this perfection of wisdom—on the basis of which bodhisattvas, the great beings should train themselves at the stage of *śrāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas* or bodhisattvas—the three Vehicles are expounded in detail.⁵⁸

In addition, the *maṅgala* verse of AA shows that from the *Prajñāpāramitā* alone, the three kinds of omniscience, which belong to *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*, bodhisattvas, and Buddhas respectively, arise:

[9] Pay homage to the mother of the Buddha with an assembly of *śrāvakas* and bodhisattvas,
Who, insofar as she is the omniscient, leads *śrāvakas* who seek the calmness into tranquility,
Who, insofar as she is the one who knows paths, makes [bodhisattvas] who act for the benefit of
living beings accomplish the goal of the world,
United with whom, sages [are able to] teach all of this in all aspects.⁵⁹

the 25,000 *Prajñāpāramitā*. However, I could find this example neither in the revised recension of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, nor in its unrevised recension.

⁵⁸. PvsP I-1 155.13-27: *śrāvakabhūmāv api āyusman subhūte śikṣitukāmena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena iyam eva prajñāpāramitā śrotavyodgrahītavyā dhārayitavyā vācayitavyā paryavāptavyā yoniśaś ca upaparīkṣitavyā. pratyekabuddhabhūmāv api āyusman subhūte śikṣitukāmena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena iyam eva prajñāpāramitā śrotavyodgrahītavyā dhārayitavyā vācayitavyā paryavāptavyā yoniśaś ca upaparīkṣitavyā. bodhisattvabhūmāv api āyusman subhūte śikṣitukāmena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena iyam eva prajñāpāramitā śrotavyodgrahītavyā dhārayitavyā vācayitavyā paryavāptavyā yoniśaś ca upaparīkṣitavyā. buddhabhūmāv api āyusman subhūte śikṣitukāmena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena iyam eva prajñāpāramitā śrotavyodgrahītavyā dhārayitavyā vācayitavyā paryavāptavyā yoniśaś ca upaparīkṣitavyā. tat kasya hetoḥ? tathā hy atra prajñāpāramitāyāṃ trīṇi yānāni vistareṇopadiṣṭāni yatra bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ śrāvakabhūmau vā pratyekabuddhabhūmau vā bodhisattvabhūmau vā śikṣitavyam.*

⁵⁹. *yā sarvajñatayā nayaty upaśamaṃ śāntyeṣiṇaḥ¹ śrāvakān | yā mārgajñatayā jagaddhitakṛtāṃ lokārtha-sampādikā | sarvākāram idaṃ vadanti munayo viśvāṃ yayā² saṅgatāḥ | tasyai śrāvakabodhisattvagaṇiṇo buddhasya māt্রে namah ||* (¹ śāntyeṣiṇaḥ] A B, śāntaiṣiṇaḥ E^p ; ² yayā] B E^p, jayā A) : A 1v1, B 1v1,

Applying these ideas to the model of the *gotra*, I believe we could understand the intentions of AA's author as well as of the two Vimuktiṣeṇas as follows: If Buddhist practitioners have *dharmadhātu* (= emptiness, the tenet of the *Prajñāpāramitā*) as objective support in their spiritual practice, they can give rise to the enlightenment of *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* as well as that of bodhisattvas and Buddhas. Therefore, it can be justified that although the division is not final, insofar as the *dharmadhātu* serves as the cause of the insight of *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*, we can still distinguish them into three categories in accordance with what they realize and place them as lower levels into our system.⁶⁰

Abbreviation

A	Palm-leaf manuscript of the <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstra</i> , the commentary on the <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> in 25,000 lines by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa (NAK 5/55 = NGMPP A 37/9), used by Pensa 1967 (= E ^P). For the details, see Lee 2017b, 17–18.
AA	<i>Abhisamayālaṅkāra</i> ascribed to Maitreya-nātha traditionally.
AAĀ	<i>Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā</i> by Haribhadra.
AAĀ ^W	Wogihara 1932-1935.
AKBh	<i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> by Vasubandhu.
AKBh ^E	Ejima 1989.
B	Palm-leaf manuscript of the <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstra</i> preserved in Tibet or Tibet autonomous region, which is placed fourteenth on Wang Sens list. For the details, see Lee 2017b, 18-20.
BoBh ^W	Wogihara 1930-1936.
D	sDe dge edition of Tibetan translation.
E ^L	Lee 2017b.
E ^P	Pensa 1967.
MAVBh	<i>Madhyāntavibhāṅgabhāṣya</i> by Vasubandhu.
MAVBh ^N	Nagao 1964.
Munimatālaṃkāra _{Tib}	Tibetan translation of the <i>Munimatālaṃkāra</i> by Abhayākara-gupta = <i>thub pa'i dgongs pa'i rgyan</i> , D (No. 3903) <i>dbu ma</i> , a 73b1–293a7; Q (No. 5299) <i>dbu ma</i> , ha 71b3-397a5 (vol. 101, pp. 146–277).
PvsP	<i>Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā</i> .
PvsP I-1	Kimura 2007.
Q	Peking edition of Tibetan translation.
Sāratamā ^J	Jaini 1979.
Śuddhimatī _{Tib}	Tibetan translation of the Śuddhimatī by Ratnākaraśānti = <i>mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i 'grel pa dag ldan zhes bya ba</i> , D (No. 3801) <i>shes phyin</i> , ta 76a5–204a3; Q (No. 5199) <i>sher phyin</i> , ta 87b8–227b8.
Vārttika	* <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāravārttika</i> by Bhadanta-Vimuktiṣeṇa.
Vārttika _{Tib}	Tibetan translation of the * <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāravārttika</i> = <i>'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i rnam par 'grel pa</i> , D (No. 3788) <i>shes phyin</i> , kha 1b1-181a7 ; Q (No. 5186) <i>sher phyin</i> , kha 1a1-207a7 (vol. 88, pp. 103–187).
Vṛtti _{Tib}	Tibetan translation of the <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstra</i> by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa = <i>'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi 'grel pa</i> (* <i>Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeś[asy]ābhisamayālaṅkāraśāstrasya vṛttiḥ?</i>), D (No. 3787) <i>shes phyin</i> , ka 14b1-212a7; Q (No. 5185) <i>sher phyin</i> , ka 15b3–249a7 (vol. 88, pp. 8–102).
Vivṛti	<i>Abhisamayālaṅkāravivṛti</i> by Haribhadra.
Vivṛti ^A	Amano 2000.

E^P 11.03–06 ; E^L [1].3–6.

⁶⁰ Cf. “Therefore, those who realize the great enlightenment (**mahābodhi*) preceded by the [two kinds of] realization of the enlightenment of *śrāvakas* and others (= *pratyekabuddhas*) is indicated to have the *gotra* of *śrāvakas* and others (**śrāvakādigotraka*) with the temporary title/ name.” *gang gi phyir gang nyan thos la sogs pa'i byang chub rtogs pa sngon ma can byang chub chen po rtogs pa de rnams re zhig pa'i dus can du bstan pas nyan thos la sogs pa'i rigs can du bstan to || Munimatālaṃkāra_{Tib} D 170b3–4. For another English translation, see Ruegg 1977, 301.*

Sources

- Amano, Koei H. 2000. *Abhisamayālaṃkāra-kārikā-śāstra-vivṛti: Haribhadra's commentary on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra-kārikā-śāstra edited for the first time from a Sanskrit manuscript*. Ed. Koei H. Amano. Kyoto: Heirakuji-Shoten.
- Brunnhuölzl, Karl. 2010. *Gone Beyond: The Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras, The Ornament of Clear Realization, and its Commentaries in the Tibetan Kagyü Tradition, volume one, translated and introduced by Karl Brunnhuölzl*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion Publications.
- _____. 2012. *Groundless Paths: The Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras, The Ornament of Clear Realization, and its Commentaries in the Tibetan Nyingma Tradition, translated and introduced by Karl Brunnhuölzl*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion Publications.
- Cicuzza, Claudio. 2001. "L'Abhisamayālaṃkāra di Ārya Vimuktisena (2-4 *Abhisamaya*): dottorato di ricerca in studi indologici." PhD diss., Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza.
- Ejima, Yasunori. 1989. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu: Chapter I Dhātunirdeśa*. Ed. Yasunori Ejima. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.
- Hong, Luo. 2010. *Abhayākara-gupta's Abhayapaddhati Chapters 9 to 14*. Critically edited and translated by Luo Hong with a preface by Harunaga Isaacson and Alexis Sanderson. Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region No.14. Beijing; Hamburg: China Tibetology Publishing House; Centre for Tantric Studies (AAI).
- Isoda, Hirofumi (磯田 熙文). "Vimuktisena (Rnam sgrol sde) について On Vimuktisena (Rnam sgrol sde)." In 《奥田聖應先生頌寿記念インド学仏教学論集》 *Indian and Buddhist Studies in honor of President Dr. Shouou (Kiyooki) Okuda in Recognition of his lifelong scholarship*, 678–684. 東京: 佼成出版社 Tokyo: KOSEI Publishing Co. Ltd..
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1979. *Sāratamā: A Pañjikā on the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra by Ācārya Ratnākaraśānti*. Ed. Padmanabh S. Jaini. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 18. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Kano, Kazuo. 2015. "Ratnākaraśānti's understanding of Buddha-nature." *China Tibetology* 25 (2015.2): 52-77.
- Kim, Seongcheol (김 성철). 2011. "종성의 본질에 대한 유가행파와 여래장 사상의 해석: '6처의 특별한 양태 (śaḍāyatanaviśeṣa)' 개념을 중심으로 On the Interpretation of the Nature of Gotra by Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha School." 《불교학리뷰》 *Critical Review for Buddhist Studies* 10: 35–68.
- Kimura, Takayasu. 2007. *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā I-1*. Ed. Takayasu Kimura. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing Co..
- Lee, Youngjin. 2017a. "On Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's Commentary on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra." In *Śrāvaka-bhūmi and Buddhist Manuscripts*, ed. by Seongcheol Kim and Jundo Nagashima, 209–233. Tokyo: Nombre.
- _____. 2017b. *Critical Edition of the First Abhisamaya of the Commentary on the Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra in 25,000 Lines by Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa: based on Two Sanskrit Manuscripts preserved in Nepal and Tibet*. Ed. Youngjin Lee. Manuscripta Buddhica 3. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale".
- Li, Xuezhong. 2013. "Diplomatic transcription of the Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Munimatālaṃkāra*—Chapter 1: Fols. 1v1-3v5—." *China Tibetology* 20 (2013.1): 1–11.
- Makransky, John. J. 1997. *Buddhahood Embodied: Sources of Controversy in India and Tibet*. SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Mano, Ryūkai. 1967. "'Gotra' in Haribhadra's Theory." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 15.2 [30]: (23)–(31).
- Matsumoto, Shirō. 1997. "The doctrine of *Tathāgata-garbha* is not Buddhist." In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*, ed. by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 165–173; 439–440 (notes). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Matsumoto, Shirō and Nobuyoshi Yamabe. 1997. "A Critical Exchange on the Idea of *Dhātu-vāda*." In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*, ed. by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 205–219; 452–461 (notes). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nagao, Gadgin M. 1964. *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya: A Buddhist philosophical treatise edited for the first time from a Sanskrit manuscript*. Ed. Gadgin M. Nagao. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Nakamura, Hodo. 2014. "Ārya-Vimuktisena's *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti* The Earliest Commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*: A Critical Edition and a Translation of the Chapters Five to Eight with an Introduction and Critical notes." PhD diss., Universität Hamburg.
- Nanayakkara, S. N.. 1992. "Gotra-vihāra." In *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism Volume V: Good and Evil—Hung-i*. Ed. W. G. Weeraratne, 381. Sri Lanka: Government of Sri Lanka.
- Pensa, Corrado. 1967. *L'Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena: Primo Abhisamaya, Testo e note critiche*. Ed. Corrado Pensa. Serie Orientale Roma XXXVII. Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1968. “Ārya and Bhadanta Vimuktisena on the *Gotra*-theory of *Prajñāpāramitā*.” *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens: Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* XII–XIII (1968–1969): 303–317.
- _____. 1969. *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra: études sur la sotériologie et la gnoséologie du Bouddhisme*. Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient.
- _____. 1977. “The *gotra*, *ekayāna* and *tathāgatagarbha* theories of the *Prajñāpāramitā* according to Dharmamitra and Abhayākara Gupta.” In *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in honor of Edward Conze*, ed. by Lewis Lancaster, 303–317. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series. Berkeley: University of California.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 2014. *The genesis of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda: Responses and reflections*. Kasuga Lecture Series I. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- Sparham, Gareth. 2006. *Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā: Vṛtti by Ārya Vimuktisena; Ālokā by Haribhadra; English Translation by Gareth Sparham, Volume one: First Abhisamaya*. Fremont, California: Jain Publishing Company.
- Wogihara, Unrai. 1930–1936. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of Whole course of the Bodhisattva (Being fifteenth section of Yogācārabhūmi)*. Ed. Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo.
- _____. 1932–1935. *Abhisamayālaṃkāra 'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā by Haribhadra: Commentary on Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā together with the text commented on*. 2 vols. Ed. Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi (山部 能宜). 1990. “真如所縁縁種子について On the *tathāgata Bīja*.” In 《日本の仏教と文化：北畠典生教授還暦記念》 *Japanese Buddhism and Culture: Papers in Honor of Professor Tensei Kitabatake on His Sixtieth Birthday*. 63–87. 京都: 永田文昌堂 Kyoto: Nagata Bunshoudou.
- _____. 1997. “The Idea of *Dhātu-vāda* in Yogācāra and Tathāgata-garbha Texts.” In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*, ed. by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 193–204; 441–452 (notes). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- _____. 2017. “Once Again on “*Dhātu-vāda*.” *Critical Review for Buddhist Studies* 21: 9–43.